

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,028	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WADA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHRISTOPHER C. CAILLOUET	<b>Art Unit</b> 1745	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) CHRISTOPHER C. CAILLOUET.

(2) HEIDI A. BOEHLEFELD.

**Date of Interview:** 16 December 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**  
 Rejection(s) discussed:  
*103(a) Rejection of claims 1-3, possible 112 new matter rejection of claim 1*

Claims discussed:  
*1, 3 and 8*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*Durrance (US 20020002358)*

**Part II.**  
 SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 10:00 AM

  

/Mark A Osce/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1745

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that claims 1 and 2 were still unpatentable over the prior art of Durrance because Applicant's claimed panel spacing step would still be interpreted as being parallel to the flow direction of the process, as disclosed by Durrance. Examiner pointed out that if Applicant would modify claim 1 to define the spacing as being parallel to the flow direction as he thinks Applicant was attempting to claim, this would cause 112 new matter issues since Applicant discloses that a spacing step in the cross direction occurs prior to rotation, as seen in Fig. 4 of the Specification. Examiner proposed making an Examiner's Amendment to claim 3 define that the panel spacing step occurs in a width direction that is parallel to the flow direction so as to put the claim in condition for allowance. Examiner stated that Claim 8 and its dependent claims were allowable over the prior art, since none of the prior art shows or discloses separating a pair of panels from a web, rotating said pair 90 degrees, and thereafter spacing the panels in a perpendicular direction to that of the flow direction for placement upon a diaper chassis web. .